

1 Alpha thalassemia/mental retardation X-linked (ATRX) protein
2 expression in human pituitary neuroendocrine tumours and its
3 reported correlation to prognosis and clinical outcomes: A
4 systematic review.

5
6 Edward Wang^{1*}, Fabio Rotondo², Michael D. Cusimano^{1,3}

7
8
9 ¹Department of Surgery, Division of Neurosurgery, St. Michael's Hospital; Injury Prevention
10 Research Office, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, Keenan Research Centre; University of Toronto;
11 Toronto, Canada

12 ²Department of Laboratory Medicine, Division of Pathology, Unity Health Toronto- St. Michael's
13 Hospital, Toronto, ON, Canada

14 ³Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada

15
16
17
18
19 *Corresponding author

20 Email: ewang242@uwo.ca (EW)

21 **Abstract**

22 Mutations in Alpha thalassemia/mental retardation X-linked (ATRX) have been implicated
23 in several cancers, including gliomas, sarcomas, neuroendocrine tumors, and other mesenchymal
24 malignancies. ATRX loss contributes to oncogenesis, accelerates tumor growth, and reduces
25 survival by disrupting epigenetic and telomere mechanisms. Additionally, ATRX loss can increase
26 tumor sensitivity to treatment therapies. While research has explored ATRX expression in many
27 cancers, data on its relationship to prognosis in pituitary neuroendocrine tumors (PitNETs)
28 remain inconsistent. This systematic review aims to summarize all available studies on ATRX
29 mutations and expression in PitNETs. A systematic search of PubMed, Scopus, and EMBASE
30 databases was conducted to identify publications between 2014 and 2024 that investigated ATRX
31 mutations or expression in PitNETs, following PRISMA 2020 guidelines. Of 30 identified studies,
32 nine met the inclusion criteria, covering a total of 500 PitNETs. Only 19 tumors (3.6%) showed a
33 loss of ATRX expression. Among these, 58% exhibited corticotropic pathology, while 26%
34 displayed lactotrophic pathology. A small subset of tumors (32%) was classified as pituitary
35 carcinomas with aggressive and proliferative characteristics. Additionally, 16% demonstrated the
36 alternative lengthening of telomeres (ALT) phenotype, 53% had concurrent TP53 mutations, and
37 21% had elevated Ki67 indices, indicating a higher proliferative index. Although ATRX mutations
38 are rare in PitNETs, tumors with ATRX loss tend to be more aggressive and exhibit proliferative
39 and transformative properties. Due to the limited number of cases, further studies with larger,
40 prospective cohorts are needed to better understand the role of ATRX loss in PitNET progression
41 and aggressiveness.

42

43 Introduction

44 Alpha thalassemia/mental retardation X-linked (ATRX) is an ATP-dependent chromatin
45 remodelling protein within the switch/sucrose nonfermentable (SWI/SNF) family of chromatin
46 remodelling proteins. The ATRX/DAXX complex, which includes death domain-associated protein
47 (DAXX), modulates the deposition of histone H3.3 at guanine-rich heterochromatin regions with
48 highly repetitive elements, including telomeres and pericentromeric regions. [1,2]. ATRX
49 preferentially binds to the heterochromatin modification H3K9me3, facilitating histone H3.3
50 deposition and maintaining heterochromatin integrity [3,4]. When ATRX function is disrupted, its
51 silencing action is impaired, leading to aberrant transcription across ATRX/DAXX-regulated
52 regions, including genomic repeats [3]. ATRX mutations have also been linked to the progression
53 of the alternative lengthening of telomeres (ALT) phenotype, a telomerase-independent
54 mechanism for cancer cell immortality [5].

55 Somatic mutations disrupting ATRX function are associated with reduced disease-free
56 survival, genome instability, and increased tumour mutation burden in gliomas, neuroendocrine
57 neoplasms, and mesenchymal tumours [6–8]. Recent investigations have observed poorer
58 prognoses in ATRX-mutated pancreatic neuroendocrine tumours (PanNETs), including shorter
59 disease-free and survival time [6]. Loss of ATRX expression is also linked to increased sensitivity
60 to radiation therapy, chemotherapy, and immunotherapeutic treatments [9]. The fifth edition of
61 the WHO Classification of Tumours of the Central Nervous System (2021) recommends including
62 ATRX status in diagnostic analyses for glioma variants and strongly supports it as a diagnostic
63 marker for PanNET severity and prognoses [6,9].

64 Pituitary neuroendocrine tumours (PitNETs), traditionally known as pituitary adenomas,
65 are common primary intracranial tumours of the adenohypophysis [10]. Like other
66 neuroendocrine tumours, PitNETs are classified based on hormonal secretion. Overproduction
67 and secretion of any adenohypophyseal hormones can cause debilitating effects associated with
68 conditions such as acromegaly and Cushing's disease. Although most clinically apparent PitNETs
69 are benign, some exhibit aggressive and invasive growth, leading to mass-effect symptoms from
70 compression of adjacent intracranial structures [11,12]. Metastases are rare and can occur in
71 tumours that appear benign histologically while other tumours that have histological features of
72 aggressiveness can remain isolated to the sellar region. Aggressive and metastatic PitNETs are
73 also resistant to traditional surgical and radiological treatments, with only temozolomide (TMZ)
74 treatment showing moderately effective and often transient pharmacological results in less than
75 half of patients [13,14]. As the use of ATRX as a prognostic marker for other neuroendocrine
76 tumours increases, it is essential to also evaluate whether ATRX can predict the aggressiveness
77 of PitNETs.

78 Currently, published data on the incidence of ATRX expression and its clinical significance
79 in neuroendocrine tumours, particularly PitNETs, is limited. The role of ATRX protein expression
80 in the prognosis of PitNETs remains unknown. In this systematic review, we interpret the existing
81 literature on ATRX expression in PitNETs to better describe its relationship with the
82 clinicopathological characteristics and prognosis of PitNET patients.

83

84 **Methods**

85 **Search strategy**

86 This systematic review was conducted following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic
87 Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines. The aim was to identify all English published
88 studies on pituitary tumours exhibiting a loss of ATRX expression. The strategy involved searching
89 the PubMed, Embase, and Scopus databases to identify relevant studies published in English from
90 January 1, 2014 to October 1, 2024, using MeSH terms combined with free search terms. A
91 combination of the following keywords was used: ATRX, pituitary, alpha thalassemia X-linked,
92 ATRX, PitNET. No other restrictions were imposed, and no attempt was made to obtain
93 unpublished results. All references and supplementary data from all selected articles were also
94 considered. The review was not registered, nor was a review protocol prepared. All data
95 collected and analyzed has been reported in the manuscript.

96 **Study selection**

97 The selection of published material was conducted based on initial screening of titles or
98 abstracts followed by screening of full-text reviews. Manuscripts were considered eligible if they
99 met the following criteria: (i) the study was published in a peer-reviewed medical journal within
100 the last ten years, (ii) the study was published in English, (iii) the study described human case
101 studies involving pituitary tumours/PitNETs and ATRX, and (iv) the study observed a loss of ATRX
102 expression or mutation in the ATRX gene (Fig 1). Studies were omitted from review based on the
103 following exclusion criteria: (i) studies with publication types other than original research articles,
104 such as review articles, editorials, letters, commentaries, and conference abstracts. Duplicate
105 files were removed following export of database search results to Covidence. Risk of bias

106 assessments were evaluated using the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) Critical Appraisal Checklist for
107 Studies Reporting Prevalence Data and the JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Case Reports [15].
108 Quality assessment was not performed, and therefore no papers were excluded due to poor
109 quality.

110

111 **Fig 1. Identification and selection of studies via databases.**

112

113 **Data extraction and quality assessment**

114 Data was extracted from selected articles and included the following characteristics:

- 115 - Study: year of publication, journal of publication, country, type of study
- 116 - Sample Data: sample size, tumour type studied, mean age of participants at the time of
117 tumour resection, sex, evaluation strategies,
- 118 - Study Results and Analysis: tumour classification, ALT status, Ki-67 index, identification of
119 other mutations within tumour sample

120 The analyzed data, including methods and results of each full-length publication, were reviewed
121 to satisfy the selection criteria and assess the quality of the text. No studies were excluded as a
122 result of poor quality of methods or unsatisfactory results. Results were independently extracted
123 by one author (EW) and assessed by another independent author (FR) to ensure accuracy and
124 inclusion of complete data. Any discrepancies were resolved by discussion.

125 **Synthesis of data**

126 All relevant patient demographics and tumour data were collected and tabulated in
 127 Excel®. Tumours that were referred to as ACTH-secreting tumours, ACTH-omas, or exhibited T-
 128 PIT expression were tabulated as corticotrophs. Null cell pituitary tumours were recorded as
 129 nonfunctional pituitary adenomas. Similarly, gonadotrophs included tumours categorized by
 130 LH/FSH secretion or SF1 expression. One study recorded gonadotrophs as nonfunctional pituitary
 131 adenomas and did not specify the number of adenomas recorded [16]. Pit-1 lineage tumours
 132 were further categorized into GH-secreting somatotroph and PRL-secreting lactotrophs.
 133 Thyrotrophs included TSH-secreting adenomas and thyrotrophic adenomas. Any tumours that
 134 did not fall under these categories were tabulated under “Other Tumour Type,” including all
 135 plurihormonal tumours, pituitary carcinomas, and pituitary rhabdomyosarcoma. Tumours
 136 exhibiting ATRX within the included categories were indicated within square brackets. Analytical
 137 techniques and evaluation strategies were indicated in Table 1 while data that was unspecified
 138 or not measured was recorded in Table 2. The statistical analysis included Fisher’s exact test for
 139 associations between tumour recurrence, and other tumour characteristics and ATRX loss. No
 140 other statistical or sensitivity analyses were conducted.

141 **Table 1. Characteristics of included publications examining the prevalence of ATRX loss in**
 142 **human pituitary neuroendocrine tumours.**

Author	Year	Journal	Country	Type of study	Sample size	Tumour Type	Evaluation Strategy	Loss of ATRX observed (# if not specified)
Casar-Borota (Trouillas)	2017	The American Journal of Surgical Pathology	Denmark	Case report & descriptive cross-sectional study	248	152 clinically nonfunctioning pituitary adenomas, 2 pituitary carcinomas	Immunohistochemical analysis; NextGen Sequencing	Yes corticotroph pituitary carcinoma

									cortic tum
Lamback (Gadelha)	2024	Journal of Clinical Endocrinology and Metabolism Case Reports	Brazil	Case report	1	Pituitary adenoma	Immunohistochemical analysis	Yes, 1 r pitu aden	

143 ** One patient was omitted from the sample, as it was repeated from Casar-Borota et al. (2017)

144

145

146 **Table 2. Demographic and clinical patient data examined in the included publications.**

Author (Date)	Average Age	Sex	Recurrent Tumour	Non- recurrent Tumour	Clinically Non- functional	Corticotroph	Somatotro
Casar- Borota (2017)	Unspecified [39]	Unspecified [F]	Unspecified	Unspecified	152	22	60
Guo (2018)	[55]	[M]	[1]	0	0	0	0
Chen (2019)	17.64 [unspecified]	27 F, 15 M [2 F, 1 M]	5	37 [3]	9	9	6
Sbiera (2019)	53.7 [52.5]	10 F, 8 M [2 F]	Unspecified	Unspecified	0	18	0

Heaphy (2020)	53.4 [unspecified]	41 M, 65 F [unspecified]	18 [unspecified]	88 [unspecified]	83	1	15
Casar-Borota (2021)*	45 [45]	14 F, 33 M [2F, 6M]	47 [8]	0	1	10 [3]	2
Lu (2021)	[77]	[M]	[1]	0	0	0	0
Alzoubi (2022)	Adult: 52.9 Pediatric: 13 [Adult: 60]	Adult: 12 F, 12 M Pediatric: 9 F, 3 M [1 M]	24 adults [1 adult]	12 pediatric	0	6 adults + 2 pediatric [1 adult]	1 adult
Lamback (2024)	63	[M]	[1]	0	[1]	0	0

147 Values in square brackets indicate samples with ATRX loss reported. ALT-positive = alternative-
148 lengthening of telomeres was present in the tumour sample

149 * One pituitary carcinoma was excluded as the patient was shared with Casar-Borota (2017)

150 ** Information regarding tumour type and status were incomplete and could not be determined

151 *** 4 pituitary carcinomas exhibited ATRX loss (2 corticotrophs, 1 silent corticotroph, 1 somato-
 152 lactotroph)

153

154

155 **Potential for bias and risk of bias assessment**

156 Preliminary screening was accomplished by one of the authors (EW) and then reassessed
 157 by a second author (FR) according to the defined criteria to ensure that the same data items were
 158 collected. The information was extracted from the full text independently by each author. These
 159 efforts were directed toward conducting the analysis with minimal bias. The study quality and
 160 presence of biases were determined using the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) Critical Appraisal
 161 Checklist for Studies Reporting Prevalence Data (see Table 3) and the JBI Critical Appraisal
 162 Checklist For Case Reports (see Table 4) [15].

163 **Table 3: Quality assessment using the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) Critical Appraisal Checklist**

164 **for Prevalence Studies**

	Casar-Borota (2017)	Chen (2019)	Sbiera (2019)	Heaphy (2020)	Casar-Borota (2021)	Alzoubi (2022)
Was the sample frame appropriate to address the target population?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were study participants sampled in an appropriate way?	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Was the sample size adequate?	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear
Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes

Was the data analysis conducted with sufficient coverage of the identified sample?	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Were valid methods used for the identification of the condition?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was there appropriate statistical analysis	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Was the response rate adequate, and if not, was the low response rate managed appropriately?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Final Scores	3/8	7/8	6/8	4/8	6/8	7/8

165 N/A = Not applicable; the checklist item was not applicable to the study design

166 Studies with final scores ≥ 6 are reported as “great” quality. Studies with final scores ≤ 4 are
 167 reported as “poor” quality. Studies with final scores = 5 are reported as “moderate” quality.

168

169

170 **Table 4: The Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) Critical Appraisal Checklist for Risk of Bias for Case**

171 **Reports that were identified**

	Casar-Borota (2017)	Guo (2018)	Lu (2021)	Lamback (2024)
Were patient’s demographic characteristics clearly described?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the patient’s history clearly described and presented as a timeline?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the current clinical condition of the patient on presentation clearly described?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Were diagnostic tests or assessment methods and the results clearly described?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the intervention(s) or treatment procedure(s) clearly described?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the post-intervention clinical condition clearly described?	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Were adverse events (harms) or unanticipated events identified and described?	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	Yes
Does the case report provide takeaway lessons?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Final Score	7/8	8/8	6/8	8/8

172 Studies with final scores ≥ 6 are reported as “great” quality. Studies with final scores ≤ 4 are
173 reported as “poor” quality. Studies with final scores = 5 are reported as “moderate” quality.

174

175

176 Results

177 Description of studies

178 A total of 46 studies were identified from database search after duplicates were removed.

179 Following screening of titles and abstracts, 16 irrelevant studies were excluded. All 30 of the

180 remaining studies were retrieved and assessed for inclusion. Of these, 21 publications failed to

181 meet our inclusion criteria and were subsequently excluded. Fourteen studies were excluded due

182 to wrong patient population, of which eleven studies did not examine samples including PitNETs

183 for ATRX expression and mutations, while three studies were excluded due to ATRX mutations

184 occurring outside of the pituitary tumour. Additionally, seven studies were excluded due

185 incorrect study design, as the studies lacked inclusion of novel cases. Consequently, a total of
186 nine publications were included based on the predetermined criteria [16–24].

187 Quality assessments were conducted for the nine studies deemed eligible for inclusion in
188 our review study. Given that the selected descriptive cross-sectional studies were retrospective,
189 analyzing tissue samples and existing medical records, subject response rate was not applicable
190 and thus excluded from the risk of bias assessment. Accordingly, both case reports and
191 descriptive studies were evaluated using an 8-point scale across various checklist parameters
192 [15]. Of the nine human studies that analyzed the prevalence of ATRX loss in PitNETs, three
193 studies presented case reports of a novel case that exhibited ATRX loss, while five were
194 descriptive cross-sectional studies. One study presented both a novel case report and a
195 descriptive cross-sectional study and was evaluated under both quality assessments [16]. Of the
196 six descriptive studies included in the review, 4/6 (67%) studies received “great” scores (≥ 6),
197 while 2/6 (33%) studies were categorized as “poor” quality (< 4) [16,20]. All four case reports
198 received “great” scores (see Tables 1 and 2).

199 Table 3 summarizes the characteristics of the studies examined, including demographic
200 data, sample size, and evaluation strategies. All studies examined were published since 2017. A
201 study was published in each of Canada, China, Denmark, Germany, Italy, Sweden, and Brazil, and
202 three studies published in the USA. Eight studies conducted immunohistochemical analysis to
203 determine ATRX protein presence, while four studies conducted NextGen sequencing to
204 determine the presence and location of ATRX gene mutations. One study did not conduct either
205 immunohistochemical analysis or NextGen sequencing. Instead, the study examined selected
206 tumours using whole-exome sequencing and Sanger sequencing [19].

207 As 7/9 (78%) of the studies were conducted on data collected prior to the change in
208 pituitary tumour classification, the tumours were referred to as pituitary adenomas. Four studies
209 examined adult pituitary tumour patients [17,19,22,24], while one study examined pediatric
210 pituitary adenoma patients [18]. Three studies included both adult and pediatric pituitary
211 adenoma patients [20,21,23]. One study did not disclose the age range of the patients included
212 in their study [16]. In total, 20 pituitary carcinoma patients were also included from three studies
213 in addition to their pituitary adenoma patients [16,17,21]. Additionally, one study presented a
214 novel case study regarding a pituitary rhabdomyosarcoma arising from a pituitary adenoma that
215 was identified to have a mutation in ATRX [22].

216 Patient data from the studies were summarized in Table 4, including basic patient
217 information and tumour types. A total of 500 tumours were examined across the nine studies
218 included. 246 tumours were clinically non-functional adenomas, 84 somatotroph adenomas, 68
219 corticotroph adenomas, 50 lactotroph adenomas, 13 gonadotroph adenomas, 2 thyrotroph
220 adenomas, and 6 pituitary adenomas present with Pit-1. Several plurihormonal tumours were
221 also included and were described in Table 4. The studies also reported 20 pituitary carcinomas,
222 including 14 classified as corticotroph, 3 as lactotroph, 2 as somatotroph, and 1 as plurihormonal.
223 It was noted that in 3 of the studies reviewed, data involving age (average), sex, and tumour
224 recurrence was incomplete [16,19,20]. Of the reported ages, the weighted average age of
225 patients was 44. Among the publications that included sex distribution data, there were 138
226 female patients and 115 male patients. Additionally, 97 tumors were identified as recurrent,
227 while 138 were classified as non-recurrent.

228 Histopathological data regarding all tumours exhibiting ATRX loss included in this review
 229 were summarized in Table 5. Only 19/500 (3.8%) tumours exhibited ATRX loss, of which 11/19
 230 (58%) tumours were classified as corticotrophs while 4/19 (21%) lactotrophs. One study reported
 231 a loss of ATRX protein expression in one tumour and partial loss in four other tumours, but did
 232 not describe the patient or tumour type of the tumours that exhibited loss of ATRX protein
 233 expression [20]. Furthermore, the researchers sequenced only the tumour sample that exhibited
 234 full loss of ATRX expression and did not reveal any ATRX genetic abnormalities. They also did not
 235 evaluate further the four cases that showed partial loss, and no information was provided
 236 regarding the extent of the loss, so they were not classified as ATRX-negative tumors. 16/19 (84%)
 237 of the tumours lacking ATRX expression were collected from adult patients, with the remaining
 238 three reported as pediatric cases [18].

239 **Table 5. Demographic and histopathological characteristics of tumours exhibiting ATRX.**

	Source	Tumour Classification	Age	Sex	Evaluation	Recurrence Status	ALT Status	Ki67	Mutations Identified
Tumour 1	Casari-Borota (2017)	Corticotroph pituitary carcinoma	39	F	IHC, NGS	NA	NA	NA	c.134_5217del; p.D45-K
Tumour 2	Guo (2018)	Corticotroph pituitary carcinoma	55	M	IHC, NGS	+	NA	80%	unspecified ATRX mutation
Tumour 3**	Chen (2019)	Lactotroph	NA	F	IHC	-	NA	<3%	NA
Tumour 4**	Chen (2019)	Lactotroph	NA	F	IHC	-	NA	<3%	NA
Tumour 5**	Chen (2019)	Lactotroph	NA	M	IHC	-	NA	>3%	NA
Tumour 6	Sbiera (2019)	Corticotroph	56	F	WES	NA	NA	1-2%	c.622G>C; p.Asp208His
Tumour 7	Sbiera (2019)	Corticotroph	40	F	WES	NA	NA	5-6%	g.7577127C>A; p.Glu27

Tumour 8	Heaphy (2020)	NA	NA	NA	IHC, WES, FISH	NA	+	NA	no mutations in ATRX g
Tumour 9	Casar-Borota (2021)	Corticotroph pituitary carcinoma	45***	M	IHC, NGS	+	NA	NA	c.748C>T; p.Arg250Ter
Tumour 10	Casar-Borota (2021)	Corticotroph pituitary carcinoma	45***	M	IHC, NGS	+	NA	NA	c.6679delG; p.Asp2227 c.3583delA; p.Arg1195f
Tumour 11	Casar-Borota (2021)	Corticotroph pituitary carcinoma	45***	F	IHC, NGS	+	NA	NA	c.4048_4049delGG; p.G c.6661G>T; p.Glu2221T
Tumour 12	Casar-Borota (2021)	Somato-lactotroph carcinoma	45***	M	IHC, NGS	+	NA	NA	c.595_6669del, p.N199
Tumour 13	Casar-Borota (2021)	Corticotroph	45***	M	IHC, NGS	+	NA	NA	c.2422C>T, p.Arg808Te
Tumour 14	Casar-Borota (2021)	Corticotroph	45***	M	IHC, NGS	+	NA	NA	c.839_840insCATG, p.A
Tumour 15	Casar-Borota (2021)	Silent corticotroph	45***	M	IHC, NGS	+	NA	NA	c.5938T>A,c.5939delC, p.Ser1980fs
Tumour 16	Casar-Borota (2021)	Lactotroph APT	45***	F	IHC, NGS	+	NA	NA	c.21_6699del, p.E8-K22
Tumour 17	Lu (2021)	Pituitary rhabdomyosarcoma arising from pituitary adenoma	77	M	NGS	+	NA	NA	c.5406dup, p.R1803Tfs*
Tumour 18	Alzoubi (2022)	Corticotroph	60	M	IHC, FISH	+	+	1%	NA
Tumour 19	Lamback (2024)	Nonfunctional null-cell pituitary adenoma	63	M	IHC	+	NA	11%	NA

240 NA = Statistic was not reported or not made available, + = Status associated with column was

241 present, - = Status was evaluated but not present at the time of reporting, IHC =

242 immunohistochemical analysis, NGS = NextGen sequencing, FISH = fluorescent in-situ

243 hybridization, WES = whole exome sequencing

244 * Mutation was collected from Casar-Borota et al. (2021)

245 ** The three lactotrophs in Chen (2019) reported to lack ATRX expression did not specify which
246 of the three cases exhibited a Ki67 index > 3%.

247 *** Only average age was reported for the 8 tumours reported to lack ATRX expression. Range
248 of ages was reported as 23-72

249

250

251 Two studies [20,22] reported the number of patients exhibiting the ALT phenotype, of
252 which a total of 14 cases were identified and only 2/14 (14%) tumours exhibited ATRX loss. 5/9
253 studies reported the presence of other mutations within ATRX-negative tumours, of which *TP53*
254 was the most frequently reported mutation (10/18). One study investigated the presence of 20
255 common glioma mutations, including IDH1, IDH2, and ATRX, within the analyzed pituitary
256 tumours, of which 1/248 tumours exhibited a loss of ATRX due to a large deletion within the gene
257 [16]. It was not specified, however, what the other 17 mutations the tumour was screened for or
258 if any other mutations were observed. Ki-67 index was also reported by five studies [17–19,23,24]
259 with different parameters, in which two studies reported proliferation indices greater than 3% as
260 elevated [18,19], whereas another study reported indices greater than 2% as elevated [23]. One
261 study reported an increase in their Ki-67 index by 80% from a prior examination but did not
262 disclose what the absolute values were [17]. One study also reported indices greater than 10%
263 as a marker of high proliferation but did not specify what they determined to be the threshold
264 for an elevated index [24]. One study investigated aggressive pituitary adenomas and pituitary
265 carcinomas, which were both characterized by increased proliferation [21].

266 Of the 20 pituitary carcinomas included in the review, 6/20 (30%) exhibited a loss of ATRX
267 expression. 5/6 (83%) carcinomas with ATRX loss were corticotroph in nature while 1/6 (17%)
268 presented as a somato-lactotroph. The remaining 14 pituitary carcinomas shared a similar
269 distribution, with 9/14 (64%) of the carcinomas reported to be corticotroph in nature, 3/14 (21%)
270 as lactotroph in nature, and 2/14 (14%) as somatotroph in nature. The average age of pituitary
271 carcinoma patients was between 16 and 69, with an average age of 42.5. Unfortunately, average
272 age of carcinomas exhibiting ATRX loss cannot be calculated due to incomplete reporting by one
273 study [21]. All carcinomas exhibited aggressive and transformative properties concomitant with
274 their diagnosis, including elevated proliferative growth, need for repeated surgical procedures,
275 resistance to drug therapies, and development of metastases. None of the studies that included
276 pituitary carcinomas examined the presence of the ALT phenotype. Only one study [17]
277 measured Ki-67 and reported an increase by 80% from a previous examination but did not
278 provide information regarding the absolute value itself.

279 In the analysis of the relationship between ATRX loss and tumour recurrence [Table 6A],
280 tumour hormone secretion [Table 6B], and patient sex [Table 6C], one study was excluded due
281 to incomplete data regarding tumour recurrence, tumour type, and sex of patients with ATRX
282 loss [20]. Two other studies were excluded from tumour recurrence and sex analysis due to
283 incomplete reporting on the two parameters [16,19]. We did not find any significant relationship
284 between loss of ATRX expression and tumour recurrence status [Table 6A]. Sex was also not a
285 significant factor in ATRX expression [Table 6C]. However, tumour type was associated with ATRX
286 expression status. As described in Table 6B, the proportion of ACTH-secreting tumours
287 (corticotroph adenomas and corticotrophic pituitary carcinomas) exhibiting loss of ATRX

288 expression was significantly different from the proportion of other tumours that exhibited ATRX
 289 loss ($p < 0.0005$). No other significant associations were observed.

290 **Table 6. Fisher’s exact tests comparing ATRX expression status and tumour recurrence (A),**
 291 **tumour hormone secretion type (B), and sex of patient (C).**

A	Status of ATRX Expression			
Tumour Recurrence**	ATRX Loss	ATRX Intact	Total	p-value
Recurrent	12	67	79	0.071
Non-recurrent	3	46	49	
Total	15	113	128	

B	Status of ATRX Expression			
Tumour Hormone Secretion***	ATRX Loss	ATRX Intact	Total	p-value
ACTH	11	72	83	1.49E-04*
Other	7	305	312	
Total	18	376	395	

C	Status of ATRX Expression			
Sex****	ATRX Loss	ATRX Intact	Total	p-value
Male	10	63	73	0.152
Female	7	66	73	
Total	17	129	146	

292 * Indicates significant p-value ($p < 0.05$)

293 ** Casar-Borota et al. (2017), Sbiera et al. (2019), and Heaphy et al. (2020) were excluded due
 294 to incomplete data reporting regarding tumour recurrence status

295 *** Heaphy et al. (2020) was excluded due to incomplete data reporting regarding tumour
 296 type. The nonfunctional case presented by Lamback et al. (2024) was included under “Other”.

297 **** Casar-Borota et al. (2017) and Heaphy et al. (2020) were excluded due to incomplete data
 298 reporting regarding patient sex

299

300

301 Discussion

302 In the current study, we reviewed all available literature on ATRX expression in PitNETs.
303 Our analysis revealed a loss of ATRX expression in approximately 3.8% of the 500 cases that were
304 studied. Although ATRX is rarely mutated within PitNETs, patients with functioning PitNETs,
305 especially corticotrophs, are over-represented ($p < 0.0005$).

306 We observed ATRX loss in 4 PitNETs exhibiting the ALT phenotype. However, not all ALT-
307 positive tumours exhibited ATRX loss, suggesting that ATRX loss is not required for the ALT
308 phenotype to progress within the PitNETs studied. While ATRX loss has been strongly associated
309 with the ALT phenotype tumour types such as gliomas and pancreatic tumours, we cannot
310 determine a relationship between ATRX function and the progression of the ALT phenotype in
311 PitNETs from currently published data.

312 Given ATRX's critical role in sustaining methylation of repetitive DNA regions, a loss of
313 ATRX expression may lead to errors in DNA replication and transcription during cell division.
314 Coupled with an increased propensity for the development of the ALT phenotype, impaired ATRX
315 function may promote the aberrant proliferative and transformative qualities observed in the
316 analysis. Similar trends have also been identified in Pancreatic NETs, where the loss of
317 ATRX/DAXX expression is associated with an increased propensity for proliferative development
318 and poor survival [6]. All studies reviewed herein reported an increase in proliferative or
319 transformative properties in tumours lacking ATRX expression. Four studies reported an elevated

320 incidence of ATRX loss in recurrent or aggressive PitNETs, both of which presented with elevated
321 proliferative traits [20,21,23,24]. However, given the multitude of factors, including initial degree
322 of tumour resection and tumour location, the data we collected and analyzed from the
323 publications demonstrated a non-significant trend with ATRX loss and recurrence in PitNETs.

324 Loss of ATRX expression was also noted in 30% of the 20 pituitary carcinomas presented
325 across the studies included in this review. Pituitary carcinomas exhibit significant proliferative
326 and transformative properties. The elevated prevalence of ATRX mutations among pituitary
327 carcinomas supports the proposed association between ATRX loss and increased propensity for
328 aggressive and proliferative development of tumours. It was also identified that 83% of the ATRX-
329 negative carcinomas were corticotroph in nature, similar to the trends identified in the data from
330 other ATRX-negative pituitary tumours collected in the review. However, as corticotrophic
331 carcinomas were overrepresented across the samples, making up 70% of all reported pituitary
332 carcinomas, it is difficult to draw any conclusions from this observation. It is also important to
333 note that in one excluded study, a pituitary carcinoma was found to exhibit ATRX mutations and
334 expression loss in a liver metastasis but not in the original tumour, highlighting the potential for
335 pituitary carcinomas to gain ATRX mutations [25].

336 It is worth noting that mutations in TP53, a well-established oncogene, were identified in
337 53% of tumours lacking ATRX expression in this study. As one of the most frequently mutated
338 genes in cancer, TP53 mutants are strongly associated with proliferative development [26]. The
339 concomitant presence of TP53 and ATRX mutations complicates the selective examination of
340 ATRX loss on the development and prognosis of PitNETs. Given the role of p53 in DNA repair and

341 tumour suppression, TP53 alterations may increase the propensity for ATRX mutations, thereby
342 promoting proliferative development in pituitary tumours. Future studies may consider
343 investigating ATRX expression in PitNETs and the interplay with TP53 mutations in prognosis of
344 these patients.

345 All tumours exhibiting ATRX mutations and loss discussed in this review were identified
346 using either immunohistochemical analysis (IHC), next-generation sequencing (NGS), or a
347 combination of both. The use of IHC for pathological analysis is a standard practice for endocrine
348 and neurological tumour diagnoses as a relatively inexpensive means of detecting changes in
349 protein expression. As ATRX mutations commonly result in truncated proteins, IHC is used to
350 identify loss of ATRX protein expression common in several tumour types [27,28]. However,
351 certain ATRX mutations have been found to result in false ATRX positivity during IHC due to
352 positive staining for protein expression despite loss in protein function [29]. As IHC is limited by
353 the antibodies available for detection, unusual mutations can limit the accuracy and effectiveness
354 of such analyses for ATRX mutations. Furthermore, there is also a lack of standardization
355 regarding determination of ATRX loss in tumours like gliomas, where specific thresholds for
356 positive ATRX expression detected by IHC are not well enforced and vary between studies [30].
357 NGS allows for more comprehensive detection of tumour mutations and can detect multiple
358 mutations across many genes in a single analysis. However, NGS is more costly and time
359 intensive, making it less accessible [31]. NGS may also miss mutations outside of the gene that
360 are impairing ATRX expression. Heaphy et al. identified a loss of ATRX expression in one case by
361 IHC but did not identify any mutations from NGS, suggesting an external mechanism affecting

362 ATRX expression [20]. A combination of IHC and NGS should be applied to provide comprehensive
363 tumour examination.

364 Three studies also used a combination of IHC, fluorescence in-situ hybridization (FISH),
365 and whole exome sequencing (WES for detection of ATRX mutations [19,20,23]. While FISH offers
366 a cost-effective means of detecting large mutations, it is not sensitive enough to detect small
367 intergenic changes that may affect ATRX expression [31]. WES applies similar practices to NGS,
368 but instead examines a sample's entire exome sequence, leading to far higher costs and time
369 detection [29]. Thus, both FISH and WES are not as effective for frequent detection of ATRX
370 mutations in PitNETs.

371 **Limitations**

372 The aim of this study was to review all published research on ATRX mutation and
373 expression in pituitary neuroendocrine tumours. To do so we must accept that we are limited to
374 the type and quality of the published articles from other leading researchers within the field.
375 With regards to our study, we found that the main limitation we identified was the heterogeneity
376 in reporting of results, hampering the ability to perform analyses regarding outcome. For
377 example, one study [20] did not report the tumour type or demographic data of the tumours
378 exhibiting ATRX expression loss, while two other studies [16,19] did not report the average age,
379 sex, and tumour recurrence status of patients in the study. Information regarding duration of
380 follow-up following prognosis and treatment were also incomplete across the study reported in
381 this review. Five studies reported varying follow-up periods between 6 months to 24 years, with
382 many limited by patient loss and time between evaluation and publication [17,18,21,22,24]. Two
383 studies also reported on the recurrent tumour characteristics and did not describe any

384 evaluations of ATRX expression in the initial tumour [20,23]. Two studies did not present follow-
385 up reports and data of the pituitary tumours [16,19]. The limited data presented regarding past
386 visits and follow-up periods for patients included in each study hinders investigations on links to
387 aggressive behaviour and recurrence. As a diagnostic marker of aggressive behaviour is
388 recurrence, limited reporting and length of follow-up results may be omitting potential tumours
389 exhibiting ATRX loss. Measurement variability also limited investigations, as the included studies
390 used different parameter thresholds for evaluation. The lack of a standard for declaring ATRX loss
391 and the limited reporting on thresholds used during IHC affect the validity of IHC evaluations of
392 ATRX loss. Furthermore, reporting on proliferative markers like Ki67 were inconsistent, with
393 varied standards for elevated values. As mentioned earlier, two studies reported elevated Ki67
394 as values greater than 3% [18,19], while one study reported values greater than 2% as being
395 elevated [23]. The inconsistent reporting of measurements limited any analyses and
396 investigations. Additionally, the limited research available regarding ATRX expression loss in
397 pituitary tumours further restricted the statistical power of the review, as very few centres were
398 involved in the collection of pituitary tumour samples used in the eight studies examined in the
399 review. As most patients were collected from neurosurgical centres, patient data may be biased
400 towards more severe and aggressive tumour cases.

401 **Future research**

402 Our literature search revealed that all identified studies were published since 2017,
403 highlighting this as an emerging field that requires further investigation. By comparing larger
404 cohorts of PitNETs with ATRX loss to those with intact ATRX function, along with adequate long-

405 term follow-up on outcomes, we can better understand the clinical significance of ATRX loss in
406 PitNETs.

407

408 **Conclusions**

409 Both ATRX loss and mutations are uncommon in PitNETs but when they do occur, they
410 primarily affect functional tumours, particularly those of the ACTH lineage. Furthermore,
411 tumours lacking ATRX expression exhibit increased proliferative or transformative
412 characteristics, including a higher incidence of ATRX loss in pituitary carcinomas. While previous
413 research has shown that ATRX represses the activation of the ALT phenotype, we identified the
414 ALT phenotype in some tumours with ATRX loss. However, not all tumours exhibiting the ALT
415 phenotype showed ATRX loss, suggesting a more complex relationship between ATRX expression
416 and ALT phenotype activation in PitNETs. This is an emerging area of study, and larger,
417 prospective studies with long follow-up and consistent reporting are crucial to further investigate
418 the implications of ATRX expression loss in PitNETs.

419

420 **Acknowledgment**

421 Authors are grateful to the Lloyd Carr-Harris Foundation for their continuous support.

422

423 **References**

424 1. Xue Y, Gibbons R, Yan Z, Yang D, McDowell TL, Sechi S, et al. The ATRX syndrome protein
425 forms a chromatin-remodeling complex with Daxx and localizes in promyelocytic

- 426 leukemia nuclear bodies. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2003;100:
427 10635–10640. doi:10.1073/pnas.1937626100
- 428 2. Voon HPJ, Wong LH. New players in heterochromatin silencing: histone variant H3.3 and
429 the ATRX/DAXX chaperone. *Nucleic Acids Res*. 2016;44: 1496–1501.
430 doi:10.1093/nar/gkw012
- 431 3. Iwase S, Xiang B, Ghosh S, Ren T, Lewis PW, Cochrane JC, et al. ATRX ADD domain links an
432 atypical histone methylation recognition mechanism to human mental-retardation
433 syndrome. *Nat Struct Mol Biol*. 2011;18: 769–76. doi:10.1038/nsmb.2062
- 434 4. Eustermann S, Yang J-C, Law MJ, Amos R, Chapman LM, Jelinska C, et al. Combinatorial
435 readout of histone H3 modifications specifies localization of ATRX to heterochromatin.
436 *Nat Struct Mol Biol*. 2011;18: 777–782. doi:10.1038/nsmb.2070
- 437 5. Darmusey L, Pérot G, Thébault N, Le Guellec S, Desplat N, Gaston L, et al. ATRX Alteration
438 Contributes to Tumor Growth and Immune Escape in Pleomorphic Sarcomas. *Cancers*
439 (Basel). 2021;13: 2151. doi:10.3390/cancers13092151
- 440 6. Singhi AD, Liu T-C, Roncaioli JL, Cao D, Zeh HJ, Zureikat AH, et al. Alternative Lengthening
441 of Telomeres and Loss of DAXX/ATRX Expression Predicts Metastatic Disease and Poor
442 Survival in Patients with Pancreatic Neuroendocrine Tumors. *Clinical Cancer Research*.
443 2017;23: 600–609. doi:10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-16-1113
- 444 7. Nandakumar P, Mansouri A, Das S. The Role of ATRX in Glioma Biology. *Front Oncol*.
445 2017;7. doi:10.3389/fonc.2017.00236
- 446 8. Ren X, Tu C, Tang Z, Ma R, Li Z. Alternative lengthening of telomeres phenotype and loss
447 of ATRX expression in sarcomas (Review). *Oncol Lett*. 2018. doi:10.3892/ol.2018.8318

- 448 9. Xie Y, Wang H, Wang S, Feng Y, Feng Y, Fan S, et al. Clinicopathological Significance of
449 ATRX Expression in Nasopharyngeal Carcinoma Patients: A Retrospective Study. *J Cancer*.
450 2021;12: 6931–6936. doi:10.7150/jca.63333
- 451 10. Asa SL, Mete O, Perry A, Osamura RY. Overview of the 2022 WHO Classification of
452 Pituitary Tumors. *Endocr Pathol*. 2022;33: 6–26. doi:10.1007/s12022-022-09703-7
- 453 11. Russ S, Anastasopoulou C, Shafiq I. Pituitary Adenoma. *StatPearls*; 2024.
- 454 12. Nishioka H. Aggressive pituitary tumors (PitNETs). *Endocr J*. 2023;70: EJ23-0007.
455 doi:10.1507/endocrj.EJ23-0007
- 456 13. Raverot G, Burman P, McCormack A, Heaney A, Petersenn S, Popovic V, et al. European
457 Society of Endocrinology Clinical Practice Guidelines for the management of aggressive
458 pituitary tumours and carcinomas. *Eur J Endocrinol*. 2018;178: G1–G24. doi:10.1530/EJE-
459 17-0796
- 460 14. Raverot G, Ilie MD, Lasolle H, Amodru V, Trouillas J, Castinetti F, et al. Aggressive
461 pituitary tumours and pituitary carcinomas. *Nat Rev Endocrinol*. 2021;17: 671–684.
462 doi:10.1038/s41574-021-00550-w
- 463 15. Aromataris E, Lockwood C, Porritt K, Pilla B, Jordan Z. *JBI Manual for Evidence Synthesis*.
464 Aromataris E, Lockwood C, Porritt K, Pilla B, Jordan Z, editors. JBI; 2024.
465 doi:10.46658/JBIMES-24-01
- 466 16. Casar-Borota O, Botling J, Granberg D, Stigare J, Wikström J, Boldt HB, et al. Serotonin,
467 ATRX, and DAXX Expression in Pituitary Adenomas: Markers in the Differential Diagnosis
468 of Neuroendocrine Tumors of the Sellar Region. *Am J Surg Pathol*. 2017;41: 1238–1246.
469 doi:10.1097/PAS.0000000000000908

- 470 17. Guo F, Wang G, Wang F, Xu D, Liu X. Identification of Novel Genes Involved in the
471 Pathogenesis of an ACTH-Secreting Pituitary Carcinoma: A Case Report and Literature
472 Review. *Front Oncol.* 2018;8: 510. doi:10.3389/fonc.2018.00510
- 473 18. Chen J, Schmidt RE, Dahiya S. Pituitary Adenoma in Pediatric and Adolescent Populations.
474 *J Neuropathol Exp Neurol.* 2019;78: 626–632. doi:10.1093/jnen/nlz040
- 475 19. Sbiera S, Perez-Rivas LG, Taranets L, Weigand I, Flitsch J, Graf E, et al. Driver mutations in
476 USP8 wild-type Cushing’s disease. *Neuro Oncol.* 2019;21: 1273–1283.
477 doi:10.1093/neuonc/noz109
- 478 20. Heaphy CM, Bi WL, Coy S, Davis C, Gallia GL, Santagata S, et al. Telomere length
479 alterations and ATRX/DAXX loss in pituitary adenomas. *Mod Pathol.* 2020;33: 1475–1481.
480 doi:10.1038/s41379-020-0523-2
- 481 21. Casar-Borota O, Boldt HB, Engström BE, Andersen MS, Baussart B, Bengtsson D, et al.
482 Corticotroph Aggressive Pituitary Tumors and Carcinomas Frequently Harbor ATRX
483 Mutations. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 2021;106: 1183–1194. doi:10.1210/clinem/dgaa749
- 484 22. Lu J, Chen L. Molecular Profile of a Pituitary Rhabdomyosarcoma Arising From a Pituitary
485 Macroadenoma: A Case Report. *Front Endocrinol (Lausanne).* 2021;12: 752361.
486 doi:10.3389/fendo.2021.752361
- 487 23. Alzoubi H, Minasi S, Gianni F, Antonelli M, Belardinilli F, Giangaspero F, et al. Alternative
488 Lengthening of Telomeres (ALT) and Telomerase Reverse Transcriptase Promoter
489 Methylation in Recurrent Adult and Primary Pediatric Pituitary Neuroendocrine Tumors.
490 *Endocr Pathol.* 2022;33: 494–505. doi:10.1007/s12022-021-09702-0

- 491 24. Lamback E, Miranda RL, Ventura N, Chimelli L, Gadelha MR. Loss of ATRX Protein
492 Expression in an Aggressive Null Cell Pituitary Tumor. *JCEM Case Reports*. 2024;2.
493 doi:10.1210/jcemcr/luae143
- 494 25. Sumislawski P, Rotermund R, Klose S, Lautenbach A, Wefers AK, Soltwedel C, et al. ACTH-
495 secreting pituitary carcinoma with TP53, NF1, ATRX and PTEN mutations Case report and
496 review of the literature. *Endocrine*. 2022;76: 228–236. doi:10.1007/s12020-021-02954-0
- 497 26. Olivier M, Hollstein M, Hainaut P. TP53 Mutations in Human Cancers: Origins,
498 Consequences, and Clinical Use. *Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol*. 2010;2: a001008–
499 a001008. doi:10.1101/cshperspect.a001008
- 500 27. Heaphy CM, de Wilde RF, Jiao Y, Klein AP, Edil BH, Shi C, et al. Altered Telomeres in
501 Tumors with *ATRX* and *DAXX* Mutations. *Science (1979)*. 2011;333: 425–425.
502 doi:10.1126/science.1207313
- 503 28. Wiestler B, Capper D, Holland-Letz T, Korshunov A, von Deimling A, Pfister SM, et al.
504 ATRX loss refines the classification of anaplastic gliomas and identifies a subgroup of IDH
505 mutant astrocytic tumors with better prognosis. *Acta Neuropathol*. 2013;126: 443–451.
506 doi:10.1007/s00401-013-1156-z
- 507 29. Reuss DE, Sahm F, Schrimpf D, Wiestler B, Capper D, Koelsche C, et al. ATRX and IDH1-
508 R132H immunohistochemistry with subsequent copy number analysis and IDH
509 sequencing as a basis for an “integrated” diagnostic approach for adult astrocytoma,
510 oligodendroglioma and glioblastoma. *Acta Neuropathol*. 2015;129: 133–146.
511 doi:10.1007/s00401-014-1370-3

- 512 30. Tanboon J, Williams EA, Louis DN. The Diagnostic Use of Immunohistochemical
513 Surrogates for Signature Molecular Genetic Alterations in Gliomas. *J Neuropathol Exp*
514 *Neurol.* 2016;75: 4–18. doi:10.1093/jnen/nlv009
- 515 31. Scheie D, Kufaishi HHA, Broholm H, Lund EL, de Stricker K, Melchior LC, et al. Biomarkers
516 in tumors of the central nervous system – a review. *APMIS.* 2019;127: 265–287.
517 doi:10.1111/apm.12916

518

519 **Supporting Information**

520 **Figure S1. PRISMA 2020 Checklist**

Identification

Studies from databases/registers (**n = 124**)
PubMed (n = 74)
Scopus (n = 50)
Embase (n = 0)

References removed before screening (**n = 78**)
Duplicate records removed (n = 78)

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.25.24316113>; this version posted October 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Screening

Studies screened (**n = 46**)

Studies excluded (**n = 16**)

Studies sought for retrieval (**n = 30**)

Studies not retrieved (**n = 0**)

Studies assessed for eligibility (**n = 30**)

Studies excluded (**n = 21**)
Wrong patient population (n = 14)
Wrong study design (n = 7)

Included

Studies included in review (**n = 9**)

Figure